



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

K-5

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,435	02/20/2001	Miroslaw Z. Bober	203185US-2 CIP	2907

22850 7590 09/25/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ENG, GEORGE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	12

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/785,435	BOBER ET AL.
	Examiner George Eng	Art Unit 2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 and 30-62 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24,30-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 59-62 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>11</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is in response to amendment filed 6/30/2003 (paper no. 10).

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 7/1/2003 (paper no. 11) has been considered.

4. The information disclosure statement filed 5/21/2001 (paper no. 7) fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 59-62 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 59-62 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-24 and 30-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leppisaari et al. (EP 884905A2 hereinafter Leppisaari).

Regarding claim 1, Leppisaari discloses a method of transmitting a video including an object of interest comprising the steps of capturing a sequence of images (64, figure 6A) in which the object of interest (19, figure 1B) occupies a fraction of each captured image (page 3 lines 39-51), tracking movement of the object of interest and selecting and extracting a region (62, figure 6A) of each captured image including the object of interest (page 3 line 52 through page 4 line 3), and coding only the selected region of each captured image to produce a coded region (page 4 lines 3-13).

Regarding claims 2-3, Leppisaari discloses to stabilize the object of interest within the selected region, wherein the selected region is selected so that the object of interest is centered within the selected region (figure 1B).

Regarding claim 4, Leppisaari teaches to transmit the coded region and decoding and displaying the selected region (page 4 lines 8-13).

Regarding claims 5-7, Leppisaari discloses the selected region is display in a format comprising fewer pixels than the format of the captured image, wherein the object of interest occupies less than a predetermined fraction of each captured image (figure 1B and 6B).

Regarding claim 8, Leppisaari discloses a method of processing a video including an object of interest (19, figure 1B) in a sequence of images comprising the steps of selecting a region of an image (16, figure 1B) including the object of interest, the selected region being of a predetermined size and coding the selected region (page 3 line 39 through page 4 line 13).

Regarding claim 9, Leppisaari teaches only the selected is coded and the rest of the image is discarded (page 4 lines 3-13).

Regarding claim 10, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 5-7.

Regarding claim 11, Leppisaari teaches the image is coded according to standard H.261 (page 4 lines 5-8) so that it recognizes the captured image, i.e., the large region, is in CIF format and the selected region, i.e., the small region, in QCIF format.

Regarding claim 12, Leppisaari discloses the selected region being scaled to compensate for movement of the object of interest backward and forward relative to a camera that captured the image (page 4 lines 14-33).

Regarding claims 13-14, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 2-3.

Regarding claim 15, Leppisaari discloses a method of processing a video including an object of interest (19, figure 1B) in a sequence of images comprising the steps of selecting a region of an image (16, figure 1B) including the object of interest, wherein the selected region is

larger than an area occupied by the object of interest by a predetermined amount and coding the selected region (page 3 line 39 through page 4 line 13).

Regarding claim 16, Leppisaari discloses that the object of interest (19, figure 1B) occupies a predetermined percentage of the selected region (16, figure 1B).

Regarding claims 17-18, Leppisaari discloses to scale the selected region to a predetermined size, wherein the predetermined size corresponds to a known image format (figure 6B and page 4 lines 3-8).

Regarding claim 19, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 11.

Regarding claim 20, Leppisaari discloses a method of transmitting video images comprising the steps of processing the video images, transmitting the encoded image data of the video images and receiving, decoding and displaying the image data (page 3 line 39 through page 4 line 13).

Regarding claim 21, Leppisaari discloses to arrange the camera (11, figure 1A) so that the object of interest occupies the fraction of each captured image and display only the extracted region of each captured image (figure 1B and pages 4 lines 3-13).

Regarding claims 22-24, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 8.

Regarding claim 30, Leppisaari discloses to compensate for changing in size of the object of interest in the sequence of images (page 4 lines 23-33).

Regarding claims 31-34, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 30.

Regarding claim 35, Leppisaari discloses the step of processing the video image further comprising the steps of capturing a sequence of images (64, figure 6A) in which the object of interest (19, figure 1B) occupies a fraction of each captured image (page 3 lines 39-51), tracking movement of the object of interest and selecting and extracting a region (62, figure 6A) of each captured image including the object of interest (page 3 line 52 through page 4 line 3), and coding only the selected region of each captured image to produce a coded region (page 4 lines 3-13).

Regarding claims 36-37, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 2-3.

Regarding claims 38-40, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 5-7.

Regarding claim 41, Leppisaari discloses the step of processing the video image further comprising the steps of selecting a region of an image (16, figure 1B) including the object of interest, the selected region being of a predetermined size and coding the selected region (page 3 line 39 through page 4 line 13).

Regarding claim 42, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 43, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 5-7.

Regarding claim 44, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 11.

Regarding claim 45, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 12.

Regarding claims 46-47, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 2-3.

Regarding claim 48, Leppisaari discloses the step of processing the video image further comprising the steps of selecting a region of an image (16, figure 1B) including the object of interest, wherein the selected region is larger than an area occupied by the object of interest by a predetermined amount and coding the selected region (page 3 line 39 through page 4 line 13).

Regarding claim 49, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 16.

Regarding claims 50-51, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 17-18.

Regarding claim 52, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 11.

Regarding claim 53, Leppisaari discloses to track movement of the object of interest in a sequence of images (page 4 lines 23-33).

Regarding claims 56-58, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 30.

Conclusion

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Eng whose telephone number is 703-308-9555. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A. Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4870. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-6306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



George Eng

Examiner

Art Unit 2643

